

these paragraphs.

In claims 2 and 7, the correct spelling of the word “barrier” is added and the misspelled form “baffler” removed. As the terms “barrier” and “blood/brain barrier” are spelled correctly throughout the original application, there is no question of new matter.

5 In claim 19, the correct spelling of “riboflavin-5- phosphate” has been added and the misspelling has been removed. As the term riboflavin-5- phosphate is used correctly numerous times throughout the application as originally filed, there is no question of new matter.

In claims 1 and 29, the limitation “intravenous” has been added. Discussions of intravenous administration may be found throughout the application (for example, in originally  
10 filed claims 22 and 25, in the detailed disclosure at page 25, lines 8 et seq, and at other places.

Previously “withdrawn” claims are now “cancelled” pending filing of a continuation-in-part presenting new refinements of the invention.

## **RESPONSE**

### **Rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 112**

15 The examiner presently rejects claim 1 for use of the word “efficient”, stating that this is vague. The examiner presumably is seeking to define “efficiency” in numerical terms. However, the applicant is free to be its own lexicographer, and the word “efficient” may be defined in non-  
20 numerical terms, and in this case, “efficient” and “efficiency” have been defined in terms of barriers to efficient metabolism and use of the administered compounds, not in terms of a number. In this case, the word “efficient” has been disclosed at great length in the application